



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

CH

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,031	10/09/2001	Dale F. McIntyre	83194F-P	5074

7590 10/04/2002

Milton S. Sales
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

HENDERSON, MARK T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3722

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	MCINTYRE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Mark T Henderson	3722	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____ .
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____ .
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . 6) Other: ____ .

Art Unit: 3722

DETAILED ACTION

Faxing of Responses to Office Actions

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)872-9302 (Official) and (703)872-9303 (for After Finals). This practice may be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-12, are drawn to an image product, classified in class 402, subclass 79.
- II. Claims 13-31, are drawn to a method of making an image assembly, classified in class 493, subclass 162.

Art Unit: 3722

1. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case printing of the information can either be done by handwriting, impact printing, and non-impact printing, or embossing.

2. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

3. During a telephone conversation with Attorney Frank Pincelli on September 30, 2002, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-12. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 13-31 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Art Unit: 3722

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. In Claim 3, it is not understood by what is meant by "reduced copy" and "reduced visual characteristics". Is applicant referring to a reduced size, color, hue..etc?

6. While applicant may be his or her own lexicographer, a term in a claim may not be given a meaning repugnant to the usual meaning of that term. See *In re Hill*, 161 F.2d 367, 73 USPQ 482 (CCPA 1947). The term "dog ears" in claim 6 is used by the claim to mean "restraining tabs," while the accepted meaning is "restraining shoulders or tabs."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 3722

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fountain (370,186).

Fountain discloses an image product assembly comprising a dual sided album leaf having a first ply (14) and a second ply (15) having an outer surface and an inner surface; the plies are secured together so as to form a pocket (20); wherein the outer surface of the first or second ply has at least one image or images (photo seen in Fig. 1); an insert (10) having a size and configuration so that it can be placed within the pocket and also wherein the insert has information (“BIOGRAPHY”) relating to the image; and wherein the insert is provided with a retaining member or dog ears (11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3722

8. Claims 3, 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fountain.

Fountain discloses an image product assembly comprising all the elements as set forth in Claim 1, and as set forth above. However, Fountain does not disclose: wherein the information also includes a copy of the associated image at a reduced copy having reduced visual characteristics; wherein the outer surfaces of the plies each have a plurality of images, and wherein the information on the insert corresponds to the images.

In regards to **Claim 3**, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place any type of image on the plies' outer surface and on the restrained insert, since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack* 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). Also, in the present case, there appears to be no new or unobvious structural relationship between the printed matter and the substrate.

In regards to **Claim 4**, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the image on any desirable ply outer surface(s), since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Art Unit: 3722

In regards to **Claim 12**, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the image assembly as one sheet folded to form two layers, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

9. Claims 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fountain in view of Young (6,061,938).

Fountain discloses an image product assembly comprising all the elements as set forth in Claim 1, and as set forth above. However, Fountain does not disclose: wherein the insert is folded such that when it is placed in the pocket, it is retained.

Young discloses in Fig. 4, an assembly comprising a slidable foldable insert (32), wherein when it is placed in a pocket (as seen in Fig. 1-3) it is retained.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fountain's to include a foldable insert as taught by Young for the purpose of holding and securing additional indicia.

10. Claim 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fountain in view of Hawley (3,848,348).

Art Unit: 3722

Fountain discloses an image product assembly comprising all the elements as set forth in Claim 1, and as set forth above. However, Fountain does not disclose: wherein the first and second ply layers are adhesively secured along three sides of four sides, wherein the adhesive is placed on two surfaces of a spacer, which is then placed between the ply layers.

Hawley discloses an image assembly comprising a spacer (6) having adhesive on both of its surfaces and placed between ply layers (4 and 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fountain's image assembly to include an adhesively placed spacer as taught by Hawley for the purpose of connecting the plies and forming a pocket for the insert.

Prior Art References

The prior art references listed in the attached PTO-892, but not used in a rejection of the claims, are cited for (their/its) structure. Young, Dean, Rawlings, Engel discloses an image product assembly.

Art Unit: 3722

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark T. Henderson whose telephone number is (703)305-0189. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 3:45 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, A. L. Wellington, can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax number for TC 3700 is (703)-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148.



MTH

September 30, 2002



A. L. WELLINGTON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700